

## Remarks

### **1. Summary of Office Action**

In the Office Action mailed May 21, 2003, the Examiner objected to the drawings because Figure 6 contained a spelling error. Further, the Examiner objected to several informalities in the specification. The Examiner then rejected claims 3, 4, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for reciting "the base station" without antecedent basis, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 7-10 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,041,241 (Willey), the Examiner rejected claims 1, 5, 6, 8, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0191583 (Harris), the Examiner rejected claims 3, 4, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Willey, and the Examiner rejected claims 9, 13, 14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Harris.

### **2. Pending Claims**

Applicant has cancelled claims 1-17 and has added new claims 18-21. Thus now pending in this application are claims 18-21, of which claims 18 and 20 are independent and claims 19 and 21 are dependent.

### **3. Response to Drawing Objections**

Applicant submits herewith a copy of Figure 6, with the spelling error in box 122 corrected. Applicant submits that this change overcomes the drawing objection.

### **4. Response to Specification Objections**

Applicant has amended the specification to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. Applicant submits that these corrections overcome the objections to the specification.

**5. Response to § 112 Rejections**

Applicant has cancelled claims 3, 4, 11 and 12. Therefore, the rejections of those claims are now moot.

**6. Response to § 102 and § 103 Rejections**

Applicant has cancelled claims 1-17. Therefore, the rejections of those claims are now moot.

**7. Claims 18-21**

Independent claim 18 is directed to a method for reducing call setup latency in a mobile station, and independent claim 20 is directed to a mobile station that is arranged to carry out functions like those recited in claim 18.

Each of these claims recites a combination of mechanisms for reducing call setup latency, as described in Applicant's specification. In particular, each claim recites the functions of (i) responding to a user request to switch a mobile station from a normal mode to a push-to-talk (PTT) mode by switching the paging slot cycle index of the mobile station to a slot cycle index at which the mobile station will check for pages more often, and (ii) receiving and buffering in the mobile station a user speech signal and then transmitting the buffered speech signal once the mobile station establishes an initiating communication leg with a PTT server. Dependent claims 19 and 21, in turn, recite that the paging slot cycle index changes from a slot cycle index of 2 to a slot cycle index of 0. The specification as filed describes these mechanisms for reducing call setup latency at page 17, line 8 to page 23, line 9.

Applicant submits that the invention as recited in claims 18-21 patentably distinguishes over the Willey and Harris references. In particular, neither Willey nor Harris, nor a combination of Willey and Harris, discloses the combination of (i) having a mobile station


switch to a higher-frequency slot cycle index in response to a user request to switch the mobile station to a PTT mode and (ii) having the mobile station buffer a user speech signal and then transmit the buffered speech signal in response to establishment of an initiating communication leg with a PTT server, as recited in the claims.

Because Willey and Harris do not disclose or suggest the combination of elements as recited in any of claims 18-21, Applicant submits that claims 18-21 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests favorable action.

Respectfully submitted,

**McDONNELL BOEHNEN  
HULBERT & BERGHOFF**

Dated: August 20, 2003

By:   
Lawrence H. Aaronson  
Reg. No. 35,818

**RECEIVED**

SEP 03 2003

OFFICE OF PETITIONS